

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/681,481	10/08/2003	Paul A. Farrar	1303.112US1	7468	
21186 SCHWEGMAI	7590 12/11/2007 N. LUNDRERG & WOES	EXAMINER			
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A. P.O. BOX 2938 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			WATSON, JOY L		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1792	,	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			12/11/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/681,481	FARRAR, PAUL A	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Joy Watson	1792	

	Joy Watson	1/92	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appear	ars on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 26 November 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	FOR ALLOWANCE.	
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follor places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No. (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in completion following time periods: 	wing replies: (1) an amendment, a ptice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in	ffidavit, or other evide compliance with 37 (ence, which CFR 41.31; or
a) The period for reply expires <u>4</u> months from the mailing date of	the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advievent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	n SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FI	f the final rejection. RST REPLY WAS FILE	OWT NIHTIW Ç
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension at CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened sta above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	nd the corresponding amount of the fee. tutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2)	n fee under 37 as set forth in (b)
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compof filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any expince a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be AMENDMENTS 	xtension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal d	of the appeal.
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brie	f will not be entered	hoogusa
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co			because .
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below		12 00011),	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or		educing or simplifying	the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		jected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		•	,
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s).		, timely filed amendm	ent canceling
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is protected. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		vill be entered and an	explanation of
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,2,5,7,9-12,14,16-18,20,22-25,41,42,4</u> Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>3,4,6,8,13,15,19,</u>			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See attached.</u> 	t does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	ince because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).		

The amendment has not been entered because it would require further consideration with respect to the halogenated hydrocarbon carrier fluid. The claims presented for the final office action indicate that "a carrier fluid" reads on a carrier fluid having some other ingredients. The amended claims after final raises the issue whether the carrier fluid comprises only of halogenated hydrocarbons. The amendment would require further consideration to determine the scope of the proposed claims and to determine whether prior art reads on a carrier fluid comprising only of halogenated hydrocarbons.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see page 9 second paragraph, filed November 26, 2007, with respect to the clarity of the surface of the substrate have been fully considered and are persuasive. The 35 USC 112, second paragraph rejection has been withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments filed November 26, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to the clarity of the definition carrier fluids, the amendment to the claims was not entered; therefore the rejection of the claims under 35 USC 112, second paragraph stands.

Application/Control Number:

10/681,481 Art Unit: 1792

In response to applicant's argument that the breadth of the claims should not be equated with indefiniteness with respect to semiconductor surface,

It is unclear whether the carrier fluid is consisting of or comprising of halogenated hydrocarbons with respect to applicant's specification that teaches "chlorocarbons or chlorofluorocarbons may be used as a carrier fluid" (p. 10 lines 10-12).

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

It is noted that the final office action dated July 24, 2007 does not contain any 35 USC 102 (b) rejections. The 35 USC 102(b) rejections of Claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 9-12, 14, 16-18, 20, 22-24, 41,42,46 from the office action dated January 22, 2007 is most due to applicant's amendment.

MICHAEL CLEVEMINER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER